



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

like that against which the ancient doctrine erected itself.

As to the moral status of the doctrine, old or new, our space will not now permit us to speak at large. There is one question, however, which we should like to ask in closing. We have often put it to individuals in private and have always got the same evasive and unsatisfactory answer. If we are under obligation as a strong independent nation to protect weak American governments against powerful European ones, why are we not morally under just the same obligation to extend our protection to any such nation anywhere on the face of the globe? The answer which has always been given us to this question is something like this: O, this is America, and we must look after her interests. European nations may do just as they please over there; it is no concern of ours; but they must keep hands off over here. As if men were not men, and right were not right, and duty were not duty, except for this half of the world!

The above article was written before the crisis of December 17 broke upon us. After studying the various opinions about the Monroe doctrine expressed since that time many of which have been thrown off hastily without study and are consequently of little worth, we see no reason materially to change our views. The divergence of sentiment on the subject is very wide, especially as to the present application of the Monroe policy. Many think it entirely applicable in its original spirit and intent. Many others believe it capable of being so extended as to apply to a boundary dispute. Others deem it to be wholly inapplicable to such a dispute. Some agree with the President that it is a part of international law. Others, including nearly all Europeans, most professors of international law in this country, and a large number of others, assert that it can in no sense be considered international law. Some "intense Americans" declare that, though it is not international law, it is a fact, whatever they may mean by that. A considerable number hold that the doctrine now has only a certain moral force and should not in any event be insisted on even "unto blood." It is likewise held by a respectable class who have examined the subject carefully that there is no more conceivable use for the doctrine, that civilization has outgrown it, that the United States does not need it, that the conditions in Europe which called it into being have practically disappeared. With the substance of this view we agree, as will be seen from the article given above. We are unable to see how at the present time the independence of the United States or the liberties and progress of the nations south of us would suffer, if the Monroe doctrine were no ewntirely abandoned.

The President has appointed Justice David J. Brewer, of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Richard H. Alvey, of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, ex-President Andrew D. White, of New York, President Daniel C. Gilman, of Johns Hopkins University, and Frederick R. Coudert, of New York, to constitute the Venezuelan Commission.

## THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE FOR 1896.

With this number we begin the fifty-eighth volume of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. We have recently received by letter and otherwise many expressions of appreciation of the character of the paper, for which we are grateful. We have tried to present in a concise and interesting way the various aspects of the peace movement in different countries, so far as we have been able to discover them. It has been our endeavor likewise to discuss the subject, in its different phases, with as much intelligence, vigor, freshness and breadth of view as we have had at command. How well we have succeeded we leave to our friends to judge. The cause is worthy of the best possible effort, and we shall spare no pains in the year before us to make the *ADVOCATE* even better than heretofore.

We wish greatly to extend the circulation of the paper. Will not our friends aid us in every community? Every cent of the income of the paper, and much more, is used in maintaining and extending the circulation. Our desire is to keep as many people as possible thoroughly informed of the state and progress of the peace movement. We would gladly send the paper free to fifty thousand ministers, teachers and others if we had sufficient funds. But we have not. We shall be much pleased and encouraged if our friends will send us New Year's contributions of any amount which they can spare. We have spent all the income of the Society the past year and a thousand dollars more, and in the present condition of the country the demand upon us is greatly increased. We wish we could adequately meet it. In renewing your subscription, send the name of some new subscriber. If you will form a club of five or more subscribers in your neighborhood, we will make the price of the paper 60 cents. This ought to bring it within the reach of nearly everybody.

---

## EDITORIAL NOTES.

At a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society held at Somerset St., Boston, December 23, 1895, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and then sent to the papers of the country through the Associated Press:

War between the United States and Great Britain is a moral impossibility. Neither nation, surely not our nation, can be guilty of the awful crime of attacking the other. Threats of war by the United States are worse than a stupendous blunder. Christianity, civilization, humanity, condemn not merely war but threats of war. Justice between nations is good, especially by the powerful to the weak. Magnanimity inspires our country to seek justice for Venezuela from Britain. The Monroe doctrine means, first, the safety of the United States and, secondarily, the protection of this hemisphere from European oppression. But our safety is assured beyond question by our power. It is inconceivable folly so to extend the Monroe doctrine that boundary disputes of ancient origin, growing out of doubtful documents or data beyond our ken must imperil the peaceful progress of Christian civilization.